

REMARKS

Claims 3, 4, 8, 11 and 13-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification is amended, claims 15-20 are added, and claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9, 10 and 12 are canceled. Reconsideration of the present application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. Priority Document

The Office Action asserts that Applicants need to submit a certified copy of the foreign priority document. Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants have submitted and the Patent Office has on multiple times acknowledged receipt of the certified priority document. Specifically, the Office Action mailed August 11, 2003 specifically acknowledges that a certified copy of the priority document has been received. As such, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to acknowledge receipt of the certified copy of the foreign priority document, or order a copy of the priority document from the International Bureau.

II. The Specification Satisfies All Formal Requirements

The Office Action objects to the disclosure as failing to provide a "Brief Summary of the Invention" section. The specification has been amended to include a section titled "Brief Summary of the Invention". Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

III. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. US2001/0052995 to Idehara; claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Idehara in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,414,809 to Hogan; claims 2, 7 and 10 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,796,951 to Hamner in view of "Mastering Windows NT Server 4", fifth edition, 1998, to Minasi; claims 3, 4, 8 and 11 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamner in view of

Minasi, and further in view of "Using Windows 95", Special Edition, 1995, to Person; claim 12 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamner and Minasi in view of Idehara and Hogan; and claims 13 and 14 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamner, Minasi and Person in view of Idehara and Hogan. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The §102(e) rejection over Idehara is moot because claims 1, 6 and 9 are canceled.

Regarding the §103(a) rejections, the applied art fails to disclose a device retrieving apparatus comprising a control unit, when an instruction is given externally via an input unit to map a desired first device symbol among the device symbols displayed on the screen to a specific individual symbol corresponding to the desired person, specifying an individual description of the desired person corresponding to the mapped individual symbol as a specific individual description, obtaining a device description mapped to the specific individual description out of mapping information, as recited in claim 3; a method of retrieving a device mapped to a desired person comprising obtaining a device description mapped to an individual description of the desired person corresponding to the mapped specific individual symbol out of mapping information, as recited in claim 8; and a computer-readable recording medium in which a specific computer program is recorded, said specific computer program causing the computer to attain the functions of: when an instruction is given externally to the computer to map a desired device symbol among the device symbols displayed on the screen to a specific individual symbol corresponding to the desired person, obtaining a device description mapped to an individual description of the desired person corresponding to the mapped specific individual symbol out of mapping information, as recited in claim 11.

Instead, Hamner merely discloses that double-clicking on a group bitmap with a cursor control device will cause the group to be expanded, in the device window 201, into a tree hierarchy consisting of all devices within the group (col. 4, lines 11-15; Fig. 2A). Minasi merely discloses that to view and manage the properties of a displayed user account or group,

simply double-click on the name of the account or group (page 349, paragraph 2). Person merely discloses that the term "drag-and-drop" means that one can click on an object, such as a folder, and then hold down the mouse button, to move the object to a new location; and that if in Windows Explorer one drags an icon of a file and drops the icon on an icon for a program, the program will start and load the file (page 105, paragraphs 4-5).

However, none of the applied art disclose obtaining a device description mapped to the specific individual description out of mapping information, as claimed in claim 3; or obtaining a device description mapped to an individual description of the desired person corresponding to the mapped specific individual symbol, as claimed in claims 8 and 11.

For example, as discussed above, Person merely discloses the feature of drag-and-drop and the ability to drop an icon of a file on the icon for a program. Hamner and Minasi only disclose the use of the double-click to select a symbol. None of the applied art can use the drag-and-drop method to map symbols to obtain a device description mapped to a specific individual description corresponding to the mapped individual symbol. Moreover, in terms of user operation, selecting a desired symbol out of multiple symbols is different from mapping a symbol to another symbol.

As such, none of the applied art disclose all of the features of claims 3, 8 or 11. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3, 8 and 11 are distinguishable over the applied art. Furthermore, those claims which depend from claims 3, 8 and 11, are likewise distinguishable over the applied art for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of the claims under §103 is respectfully requested.

With respect to claim 4, none of the applied art overcomes the deficiency of the base references with respect to claim 3, and therefore claim 4 is allowable at least for its dependence on an allowable base claim. Furthermore, none of the applied art disclose a

device wherein a control unit causes data symbols representing respective data kept in the device to be displayed in a specific area on the screen of the display unit, which is different from an area in which at least one of the obtained device description, and the corresponding second device symbol is displayed.

Hamner merely discloses in a device window 201, a hierarchial tree structure showing device groups, device names and bitmaps (icons) belonging to the device groups (Fig. 2A). The task window 202 discloses the tasks and categories of the tasks executed by the specific devices, and the device groups selected in the device window 201 (Fig. 2A).

However, Hamner does not disclose showing data symbols representing data stored by the devices. Thus, Hamner fails to disclose a device retrieving apparatus wherein a control unit causes data symbols representing respective data kept in the device to be displayed in a specific area on the screen of the display unit, which is different from an area in which at least one of the obtained device description, and the corresponding second device symbol is displayed, as claimed in claim 4.

Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 is distinguishable over the applied art. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 under §103 is respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jude L. Cooney
Registration No. 54,045

JAO:JLC/aaw

Attachment:
Petition for One-Month Extension of Time

Date: **June 21, 2004**

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--